PROPOSAL EVALUATION PLAN
Tracking #: _____

Task Order (TO) Title:

(to check boxes, right click your mouse, click "Properties:" click Default value "Checked")

Basis of Best Value Evaluation (check one): ☐ Trade-Off Process   ☐ Lowest-Price, Technically Acceptable

See Chapter 3, Paragraph 8 of the Task Order Guidelines for an explanation of each method.

Non-Cost Factors
During the evaluation, the attached color scheme will be used to score the following non-cost factors

List the specific areas of your past performance requirements to be evaluated. These areas should correspond with, and relate to, specific SOO/PWS/SOW requirements

1. Past Performance. **Max # Pages allowed:** ____ (Normally 2 pages per PP effort)	State Relative Importance: **Medium** _____ [Most Important Factor; Least Important Factor; or All Factors Equal]. State Relative Importance of SubFactors: _____ [Listed in descending order of importance or All subfactors are equal]. _____

a. Contractor shall have a minimum of Nine years experience in the Analysis of GCSS data sources.

b. Contractor shall have experience analyzing and working with the CC 129 requirements.

c. Contractor shall have experience querying multiple disparate databases

List the specific areas of your technical/management requirements to be evaluated. These areas should relate to specific SOO/PWS/SOW requirements.

2. Technical / Management Approach. **Max # Pages Allowed:** ____ (normally 10 pages, excluding resumes – if requested)	State Relative Importance: **High** _____ [Most Important Factor; Least Important Factor; or All Factors Equal]. State Relative Importance of SubFactors: _____ [Listed in descending order of importance or All subfactors are equal]. _____

a. Contractor shall have a minimum of seven years experience and subject Matter expertise in the analysis of GTN, JOPES,GSORT, NGA (Air fields, Seaports), and two years of DMDC, GDSS, CFDB.

b. Contractor shall have experience with supporting the Joint Staff

c. Contractor skill mix shall have knowledge of web focus, GCSS mapping and drilling

d. Contractor shall have expertise in GCSS drilling and mapping functionality

Cost Factor

Indicated above is the importance of the past performance, technical/management approach and any other non-cost factors for which you may want to evaluate contractor proposals. Note that balancing cost against the non-cost factors is how you make your best value trade-off decision, and as a result, a percentage is not applied to the cost factor. Indicate whether **all non-cost** evaluation factors, when combined:

☐ Are significantly more important than: ☐ Approximately equal to: ☐ Significantly less important than:

...the Cost Factor

In addition, indicate whether or not you want the estimated total dollars available for this requirement to be disclosed to the vendors.

XX NO - do not disclose available funds   ☐ **YES** - disclose available funds: $ _____
(Typically – "No")   *(amount)*

Indicate type of technical proposal requested:　　　☐ Oral　　XXWritten
　　　(Typically – "Written")

If an oral technical proposal is requested, indicate any additional guidance for the vendor. It is recommended you review Section G.4 of the ENCORE II contracts to determine if any other requirements should be included in the vendors' technical oral presentations (i.e. cost, security, etc). Please indicate whether the additional information should be part of the oral presentation or hard copy to be passed out following the oral presentation. Also, indicate the amount of time to be allowed the vendor to conduct the presentation (include additional time for questions and answers). **Note: The TM or POC is responsible for scheduling vendor proposal presentations to include time and place**.

SAMPLE COLOR SCHEME FOR SCORING PROPOSALS
AND RISK ASSESSMENT TABLE
(MUST RATE EACH NON COST FACTOR)

Color	Tech/Mgmt/Other	Strengths	Weaknesses	Past Performance
Blue	The proposal exceeds requirements and clearly demonstrates the Offeror's capability to deliver exceptional performance.	There are numerous strengths that are of direct benefit to the Government.	Weaknesses are considered insignificant and have no apparent impact to the program.	Highly relevant/very recent past performance in all identified past performance efforts: excellent performance ratings.
Green	The proposal is satisfactory; the Offeror is capable of meeting performance requirements.	Some strengths exist that are of benefit to the Government; the strengths clearly offset weaknesses.	A few weaknesses exist; they are correctable with minimal Government oversight or direction.	Relevant/somewhat recent past performance in all identified past performance efforts: acceptable performance ratings.
Yellow	The proposal is minimally adequate; the Offeror is most likely able to meet performance requirements.	Few strengths exist that are of benefit to the Government; the strengths do not offset the weaknesses.	Substantial weaknesses exist that may impact the program; they are correctable with some Government oversight and direction.	Somewhat relevant/not very recent past performance: mostly acceptable performance ratings.
Red	The proposal is highly inadequate; the Offeror cannot meet performance requirements.	There are no beneficial strengths.	Numerous weaknesses exist that are so significant that a proposal rewrite is not feasible within a suitable timeframe.	Little relevant past performance identified: almost all unacceptable performance ratings.
White				Completely lacks relevant performance history or is unavailable.

Risk Assessment Description Table

Risk	Description
High	Offeror's proposed approach is likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increase in cost, or degradation of performance and will require a high level of contractor emphasis and Government monitoring to overcome difficulties.
Medium	Offeror's proposed approach is likely to cause a moderate disruption of schedule, increase in cost, or degradation of performance and will require a medium level of contractor emphasis and Government monitoring to overcome difficulties.
Low	Offeror's proposed approach is likely to cause minimal or no disruption of schedule, increase in cost, or degradation of performance and will require a low level of contractor emphasis and Government monitoring to overcome difficulties.